



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/752,640	01/07/2004	Randy Lohrentz	34016	6019

23589 7590 01/19/2005

HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP
2405 GRAND BLVD., SUITE 400
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108

EXAMINER

KOVACS, ARPAD F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3671

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/752,640	Applicant(s) LOHRENTZ ET AL	
	Examiner Árpád Fábián Kovács	Art Unit 3671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 24-29, 32, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Lohrentz (6415590).

Claims 24-29, 32, 34, deal with having one cross conveyor (20) which can be lifted so that harvest can be placed behind or laterally by lifting the cross conveyor (see col. 1, In 38-52);

The main conveying is considered to be the conveyor between the header cutting means and the cross conveyor;

In re claim 24:

Frame (22), the brackets, fasteners are inherent or disclosed in by the prior art;

In re claim 25. 26:

Side by side driven rollers & crop engaging portions (fig 3, at ref 20)

In re claim 27:

The conveyor is hydraulic motor driven (ref 56).

Art Unit: 3671

As applied to claim(s) 28-29, 32, 34, in view of the structure disclosed/taught by Lohrentz, the method of operating/using the device is inherent since it is the normal and logical manner in which the device is used.

3. Claims 1-7, 9, 9-15, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Jennings (5231826).

Claims 1-7, 9, 9-15, 17, discloses having an 2nd/extension/wing conveyor a cross conveyor driven faster (see col. 7, 50-62, the 2nd conveyor preferably driven a faster speed);

The fluffing takes place due to the faster speed or due to the elevation of ref 30a;

In re claim 17: the 2nd/extension/wing conveyor operable separately or independently (col. 4, ln 49-51; see also, col. 9, about independently driving the hydraulic motor).

Art Unit: 3671

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim(s) 8, 16, 18-27, 30-31, 33 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lohrentz (6415590), in view of Jennings (5231826).

Lohrentz discloses the claimed device except for 2nd conveyor.

Jennings discloses that it is known in the art to provide a 2nd 2nd/extension/wing conveyor.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the cross conveyor of Lohrentz with the extension conveyor of Jennings, in order to extend the range (outside the wheel) for depositing/providing a windrow.

As applied to claim(s) 30-31, 33, in view of the structure disclosed/taught by Lohrentz as modified by Jennings, the method of operating/using the device would have been obvious since it is the normal and logical manner in which the device is used.

Art Unit: 3671

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Peeters et al., Dow et al., van der Lely et al., Leshner et al., Bittle, McRobert, Siri, Curl, Case, Gates et al., Blaser et al., Nerness.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Árpád Fábián Kovács whose telephone number is 703-308-5897. The examiner can normally be reached on Mo-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will can be reached on 703 308 3870. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Árpád Fábián Kovács
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3671

ÁFK